



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE WORSHIP OF THE ROMAN EMPERORS IN SPAIN

BY GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

IN order to make clear the position of the worship of the emperor and of the various associated cults in a province so completely Romanized as Spain, it seems necessary to say a few words about the influences which combined to bring this institution into being and to foster its rapid growth.

Undoubtedly, the most important influence in forming the cult came from Greece and the Orient¹. In the East the very idea of monarch implies divinity, and in Greece also very similar notions prevailed. Thus, even in the best period of Greek history, we find divine honors paid to Lysander². Nevertheless, in spite of the prevalence of such ideas in the Greek mind, the formal recognition, so to speak, of such a cult did not take place until after the death of Alexander the Great, at a period when a great flood of Orientalism was sweeping over the Greek world as a result of the vast conquests of the Macedonian king. Alexander called himself the son of Ammon Ra, and his immediate successors, especially at Pergamum and in Egypt, were not slow to claim for themselves divine honors, or to associate their own worship with that of the most ancient and revered Hellenic deities. Thus, at Pergamum, sacrifices were offered to Eumenes I before he took the title of king³. In the honorary decree of an association of actors at Teos⁴ we see clearly the development of the cult of the Attalidae. In Cyprus the

¹ Best treated by Hirschfeld: *Zur Geschichte des römischen Kaisercultus. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1888, zweiter Halbband, p. 833 ff. To this article I am especially indebted. Beaudouin, *Le Culte des Empereurs dans les Cités de la Gaule Narbonnaise*, has a few incidental remarks on the same subject.

² Plutarch, *Lysander*, 18.

³ Hirschfeld, *l. c.* p. 834.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 834.

Ptolemies¹ were honored in close connection with the cult of Dionysus. When we consider the close commercial relations existing between Rome and Hellenized Egypt, the deep impress set on Roman literature by Alexandrianism, and the keen interest shown in Egyptian affairs by Antonius, Caesar, and Octavianus, it seems not unreasonable to believe that the well organized worship of the Ptolemies served as the model for the deification of the Roman emperors.

Even under the Republic, however, the military prowess and the administrative ability of several Roman generals were distinguished in the East by divine honors. Thus to Flamininus², in association with Zeus, Roma, and Fides Romana, sacrifices were offered; to him in association with Apollo and Hercules public buildings were consecrated. In fact, Plutarch mentions a priesthood established in his honor which was still active in the second century. So also Sicily gave festivals to Verres³, and Cilicia a temple to Appius⁴. Indeed, the dedication of temples to the Roman proconsuls became almost an established custom⁵.

There were two other forces, distinctly Roman, of which I shall presently speak, that exercised a most important influence on the growth of the imperial cult. It was largely the effect of these two forces, counteracting to no inconsiderable extent the slavish adulation of the eastern cult, that gave to the imperial worship a national spirit and a practical reverence. These it was which made this new religion spread so rapidly in Italy and in the thoroughly Roman provinces of the West. Even in the East these influences were felt to some extent, though the Roman emperors on the whole wisely permitted these peoples to indulge in that ecstatic adulation which was so well suited to their national genius. The result of this policy was a broad line of cleavage between the imperial religion of the East and that of the West. The worship of the emperors in the East was an almost fulsome adoration paid to a man whose royalty gave him a place among the gods, who was in fact a god become man. The worship of the emperors in the

¹ Cf. *CIG.* 2620.

² Plutarch, *Flamininus*, 16. Cf. Beurlier, *Le Culte Imperial: Son Histoire et son Organisation*, p. 5.

³ Boissier, *La Religion Romaine*, I, p. 113.

⁴ *Ibid.* I, p. 113.

⁵ Cicero, *ad Quint.* I, I, 26; *Ad. Att.* 5, 21; Suet. *Aug.* 52.

West, also, as the result of its eastern origin had much of this personal element, but the preponderating influence of these two Roman forces made the cult to a large extent the worship of the abstract spirit of Roman civilization and unity as personified in the emperor.

The worship of ancestors was the first of these forces. The important part occupied by the worship of the Lares, or the deified spirits of ancestors in family life, is well known. Equally dear to the humble classes of the city was the worship of the Lares Compitales, which was thoroughly reorganized by Augustus in the year 8 B.C. Just as the custom arose of putting the image of Augustus among the Lares of the household, so also he was naturally associated with this reorganized cult of the Lares Compitales. Hence this institution of the Lares Augusti, as it was called, symbolized to the Romans the truth that the spirit of the emperor was as closely interested in the concerns of the humblest family in the empire as were the divine spirits which protected the health and prosperity of the family or the *vicus*.

The second force, the association of the worship of the emperor with that of the Dea Roma, exercised an even more important influence upon the cult, for it brought this new worship into close connection with the national life of the state, just as the institution of the Lares Augustales brought it into relation with the private life of the citizens, or through the institution of the Lares Compitales with the smallest units of the state, the *vici*. Since to every true Roman his position as a citizen was of vastly more importance than his place as an individual in the family, the association of the worship of the emperor with that of Dea Roma, the personification of the Roman state, must have had a far greater effect than the association with the cult of the Lares. The separate worship of Dea Roma can be traced back at least to the year 195 B.C. when a temple to this divinity was built at Smyrna¹. Alabanda in Caria and other cities followed suit². When, therefore, the worship of the emperor was associated with that of Dea Roma, the general conception of the emperor, as the chief and representative of the state, rather than any particular emperor was adored.

Under such circumstances the rapid spread of this official religion in

¹ Tacitus, *ab excessu*, 4, 56.

² Livy, 43, 6. Eckhel, *D. N.* II, 571.

Italy and the provinces is not surprising. The high state of development attained is attested by the large number of inscriptions which show a very complete and elaborate organization of the various priest-hoods devoted to this cult. With the practical completion of the Corpus of Latin Inscriptions, the work of collating these inscriptions has received much attention. The inscriptions of Africa were collated by Hirschfeld in a most interesting article in the *Annali dell' Istituto*¹. A similar work was done for Gallia Narbonensis by Beaudouin in an equally successful manner². Beurlier's treatment³ of the whole field is both thorough and suggestive. Finally there appeared in the *Rivista di Filologia* for the year 1890-91 an article by Ettore Ciccotti entitled *I Sacerdoti Municipali e Provinciali della Spagna e gli Augustali nell' Epoca Imperiale Romana*. While this article on the whole affords a satisfactory treatment of the subject, a fresh treatment of the Spanish inscriptions is now desirable for at least four reasons. In the first place, since we have a number of Spanish inscriptions, dealing with the imperial worship, but having no connection with any priestly colleges, a work of somewhat different scope, which should treat of the Worship of the Emperors rather than the Priesthoods in Spain, would contain much that is new. In the second place several new inscriptions may now be added to the lists given by Ciccotti. Then again, although his article contains most careful collations of inscriptions, no attempt has been made to give an account of the historical development of the imperial cult, nor has the evidence of inscriptions from other provinces been adduced for purposes of comparison. This was not at all necessary for an article upon the priesthoods, but for a consideration of the worship of the emperors it seems essential. Finally, it seems to me that a rather more positive statement can be made upon a number of points about which Ciccotti has only dared to draw timid inferences. For all of these reasons a new treatment of the subject from a slightly different standpoint, with the addition of inscriptions recently found, and with

¹ *I Sacerdoti dei Municipii Romani nell' Africa. Annali dell' Istituto*, XXXVIII, pp. 28-77.

² *Le Culte des Empereurs dans les Cités de la Gaule Narbonnaise. Annales de l'Enseignement Supérieur de Grenoble*, 1891, III.

³ *Le Culte Impérial: Son Histoire et son Organisation*.

an attempt to gain greater historical perspective, will perhaps be of value¹.

The twofold division of the Roman province into *municipia* and *conventus* leads naturally to a threefold development of the imperial cult: in the *municipia*, in the *conventus*, and in the province. In the present article, therefore, I shall consider first the municipal priest-hoods, second the conventual priest-hoods, and third the provincial priest-hoods, grouping together under these three categories the priests of the same college. Before proceeding to this task, however, it will be well to discuss such Spanish inscriptions relating to the imperial cult as can be definitely dated, for we shall thus gain some conception of the development of this worship. I have arranged these inscriptions under imperial reigns².

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF SPANISH INSCRIPTIONS

a) Reign of Augustus

Eph. Epig. VIII, p. 504, No. 280. 3/2 B.C.

Imp(eratori) Caesari divi f(ilio) Aug(usto), pont(ifici) max(imo), trib(unicia) pot(estate) XXI sacrum.

5182. Salacia in Lusitania. 10 A.D.

Imp(eratori) Caesari divi f(ilio) Augusto, pontifici maximo, co(n)-s(uli) XII, trib(unicia) potestate XVIII. Vicanus Bouti f(ilius) sacrum.

2703. Astures Transmontani in Tarraconensis. 9/10 A.D.

Imp(eratori) Caesari Augusto divi f(ilio), co(n)s(uli) XIII, imp(era-
tori) XX, pont(ifici) max(imo), patr(i) patriae, trib(unicia) pot(estate)
XXXII / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /
sacrum.

2106. Urgavo in Baetica. 11/12 A.D.

Imp(eratori) Caesari Aug(usto), pont(ifici) max(imo), trib(unicia)
pot(estate) XXXIII, co(n)s(uli) XIII, patri patriae. Victoriae sa-

¹ I shall not treat the *Augustales* in this paper, because so much has already been written upon that subject, and because their organization was utilized for civic even more than for religious purposes. I shall also omit such inscriptions as refer to the identification of the emperors with any of the great gods, because the mere epithet Augustus, which is usually the only sign of this identification, may be at times applied only to the God without any notion of the emperor.

² Some of these inscriptions come within certain reigns; for others the mention of a certain emperor or office establishes a *terminus post quem*.

cr(um) L(ucius) Aemilius L(uci) f(ilius) Nigellus aedilis, IIvir d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecit).

3524. Murcia in Tarraconensis. An inscription to the *genius* of Augustus, which therefore dates from his lifetime¹.

b) Reign of Tiberius

Tiberius reigned from 14 to 37 A.D. He was never deified and endeavored to prevent adoration during his lifetime². Hence inscriptions relating to his worship are especially striking, and in view of the general detestation in which he was held at Rome in the latter years of his reign and after his death, it seems not unreasonable to refer such inscriptions as relate to his worship, and are without other indications of date, to his lifetime, when we know that he was popular in the provinces. Such an inscription is 49, found at Pax Julia in Lusitania, which mentions a *flamen Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti)*. A similar inscription is 1516, Ipagrum in Baetica, 28 A.D., which is a dedication to the Numen *Ti(beri) Caesaris Augusti*. In 2181, Lucius Sempronius Longus, *Magister Larum Augustalium* makes a dedication to Tiberius. We cannot be absolutely certain that this was an inscription for the worship of the emperor Tiberius, but the position held by Sempronius makes this the most natural supposition.

The worship of other members of the imperial family which later developed into the cult of the *domus divina* is illustrated by two inscriptions:

194. Olisipo in Lusitania.

Q(uinto) Iulio Q(uinti) f(ilio) Gal(eria) Ploto aedili, IIvir(o), flmini Ger(manici) Caesaris, flmini Iuliae Aug(ustae) in perpetuum.

Since Iulia Augusta was the title given Livia by the will of Augustus, and since Germanicus was at the height of popular favor during the earlier years of Tiberius's reign, it seems reasonable to refer this inscription to that period.

2038. Anticaria in Baetica. 14/29 A.D.

Iuliae Aug(ustae) Drusi [fil(iae)] di[(vi) Aug(usti)], matri Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti), principis et conservatoris et Drusi Germanici, gen[etrici] orbis, M(arcus) Cornelius Proculus pontufex Caesarum.

¹ On the *genius* cf. p. 128.

² Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26 and 27; Tacitus. *ab excessu.* 2. 87; Dio Cassius. 57-

This inscription set up by a *pontifex Caesarum* is certainly religious, not merely honorary. The efforts made by members of the imperial household to foster the imperial worship is illustrated by three inscriptions in which Germanicus appears as *flamen Augusti*: the first, 1517, Ipagrum in Baetica, 18 A.D.; the second, 2198, Corduba in Baetica, 18 A.D.; the third, 2039, Anticaria in Baetica, 18/19 A.D. This last inscription probably proves the worship of Germanicus also, for Cornelius Proculus, the dedicator, is *pontifex Caesarum*. 2040, Anticaria in Baetica, 23 A.D., is similarly to be referred to the worship of Drusus, if the restoration of Huebner is to be accepted:

[Druso Caesari Ti(beri) Aug(usti) f(ilio)], divi Aug(usti) n(epoti), divi Iuli pron(epoti), tribunicia potestate I[I], co(n)s(uli) II, pontufex Cornelius Bassus, pontufex Caesarum d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit), d(edicavit).

c) Reign of Caligula

Under Caligula we have four inscriptions, two of which clearly refer to the worship of the deified Augustus. In 1534, Ulia in Baetica, P. Aelius Fabianus is *flamen divi Augusti* as well as *praefectus Gaii Caesaris*. The same is true of Lucius Servilius Polio, mentioned in 5120, Carma in Baetica. The third inscription almost certainly refers to the worship of the elder Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus and mother of Caligula¹:

3379. Mentesa in Tarraconensis.

Agrippinae G(aii) Caesaris Augusti Germanici matri. Q(uintus) Fabius Hispanus, flamen Augus(ti) decreto ordinis ded(icavit).

The fourth inscription is perhaps the most interesting of all. It shows how completely the position of Augustus as a god was established by introducing his name into an oath on a perfect equality with Iuppiter Optimus Maximus and the other immortal gods:

172. Aritium Vetus in Lusitania.

Ius Iurandum Aritiensium. ex mei animi sententia ut ego iis inimicus ero quos G(aio) Caesari Germanico inimicos esse cognovero et si quis periculum ei salutiq(ue) eius in[f]er[t] in[tul]erit[v]e armis bello internecivo terra marique persequi non desinam quo ad poenas ei per-

¹ Cf. Eckhel, *D. N.* VI, 213.

solverit; neq[u]e liberos meos eius salute cariores habebo eosque qui in eum hostili animo fuerint mihi hostes esse ducam. Si s[cie]ns fa[l]lo fefellerove tum me liberosq(ue) meos Iuppiter Optimus Maximus ac divus Augustus ceteriq(ue) omnes di immortales expertem patria incolumitate fortunisque omnibus faxint.

d) Reign of Claudius

Of the inscriptions which have come down to us from the reign of Claudius we cannot speak with so great certainty. No. 1518 (Ipagrum, 47 A.D.) belongs here if the restoration *sodales* be correct. No. 1569 (Ipsca Baetica) probably belongs here also, although it may possibly be only an honorary inscription¹. Its date is 46 A.D.:

[Ti(berio)] Claudio Caes(ari) Aug(usto) Germ(anico), pont(ifici) max(im)o, trib(unicia) pot(estate) V, imp(eratori) X, p(atrici) p(atriciae), co(n)s(uli) desig(nato) IIII Optatus Reburri l(ibertus) imag(inem) Caes(aris) Aug(usti), p(atris) [p(atriciae)] d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) eamque cum Optato et Reburro filis dedicavit. Senatus decrevit perpetuo bonis publicis interesse.

4217, Tarraco Tarraconensis, mentions one Fuscus, who was *flamen divi Claudii* and afterwards became flamen of the province of Hither Spain. It is, of course, later than 54 A.D. The same may be said of 3114 and 5879, both of which come from Cabeza del Griego in Tarraconensis and show the existence of the *Sodales Claudiani* in Spain.

e) Reigns of later Emperors

We have no inscriptions from the reign of Nero, and but few which can be definitely assigned to the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, or Nerva, or for which any one of these reigns makes a *terminus post quem*. 2637, Asturica in Tarraconensis, is shown by the expression *divus Vespasianus* to be after 79 A.D. It records the *cursus honorum* of Lucius Pompeius Faventinus, who was flamen of Hither Spain and sacerdos of Rome and Augustus. I have not much doubt that 1570 implies the consecration of an edifice to the worship of some Augustus, probably to Vespasian himself:

¹ The *imagines* played an important part in the worship of the emperors. Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 26; Pliny, *Paneg.* 52; Beurlier, *l. c.* p. 53.

1570. Ipsca in Baetica.

Sacrata domus Augusto M(arcus) Clodius . . . pont(ifex) design(a-tus, cum Annia . . . et M(arco) Clodio Rustico et . . . Clodio Marcello f. imp(eratori) Caes(ari) Vespasian[o] Aug(usto) d(e) sua p(ecunia) d(edit) d(edicavit).

Two inscriptions, 3271 and 4212, refer to the emperor Titus as *divus* and therefore come after 81 A.D. The first, found at Castulo in Tarraconensis, mentions a *flamen Augustalis*; the second, found at Tarraco itself, is in honor of one Gaius Egnatuleius Seneca who was a *flamen divi Titi*.

The formula of the Genius which is usually employed of the living emperors, places 1963 in the reign of Domitian, 81-96 A.D. :

1963. Malaca in Baetica.

Facito ut is iuret per Iovem et divom Augustum et dium Claudium et divom Vesp(asianum) Aug(ustum) et divom Titum Aug(ustum) et Genium imp(eratoris) Caesaris Domitiani Augusti deosque penates¹.

6095, Tarraco in Tarraconensis, describes the career of Lucius Fonteius Maternus Novatianus, a flamen of divus Vespasianus, who was raised to the equestrian rank by the emperor Nerva.

From the reign of Trajan (98-117 A.D.) we have a large number of inscriptions, nearly all of which refer to Licinius Sura, the famous general. 4508, Barcino in Tarraconensis, shows that this Licinius Sura was *pontifex* and *Sodalis Augustalis*. Then we have a series of inscriptions, Nos. 4536-4548, upon statues set up to Lucius Licinius Secundus, *accensus* to the general².

2344. Mellaria in Baetica. 100 A.D.

G(aio) Sempronio Sperato, flamini divorum Aug(ustorum) provinciae Baeticae, imperatore Nerva Traiano Caes(are) Aug(usto) Germ(anico) III, Vicerio Alariano et L(ucio) Marcio Postumo co(n)s(ulibus). Hic provinciae Baeticae consensu flaminis munus est consecutus peracto honore flamin(is) et feciali(s) omne concil(ium) et consensus statuam decrevit.

Under Hadrian we have an inscription, 6145, describing the official career of Lucius Minicius Natalis, a *sodalis Augustalis*, which was

¹ I have given only the essential clause in this long inscription.

² Since these inscriptions are important only as showing the great honor in which the *accensus* was held, I have only referred to them by number.

apparently set up on the dedication of some public baths at Barcino in Tarraconensis. Here also belongs 4230, which is clearly after the reign of Hadrian :

4230. Tarraco in Tarraconensis.

Gn(aeo) Numisio Gn(aei) fil(io) Sergia Modesto, Carthag(ine), omnib(us) honorib(us) in re p(ublica) s(ua) functo, electo a concilio provinc(iae) ad statuas aurandas divi Hadriani, flam(ini) P·H·C·P·H·C.

1371. Callenses in Baetica, a dedication made to Hadrian by Marcus Messius Rusticus Aemilius Papus Anius Proculus Iulius Celsus, a *sodalis Augustalis*, may be referred to the year 128 A.D.

That the *sodales Augustales* still existed in Spain at the time of Antoninus Pius is shown by an inscription found at Salpensa in Baetica. No. 1283.

To the age of Marcus Aurelius belongs an inscription from Barcino in Tarraconensis, 4514, which contains the public bequests of Lucius Caecilius Optatus to that town.

An inscription dating from the reign of Caracalla shows the high esteem in which the flamine was held at that late period :

2221. Corduba in Baetica.

[Fabio M. f(ilio) Gal(eria)] . . . Do, [flam]ini divor(um) Aug(ustorum) provinc(iae) Baet(icae). Huic consummato hono[re] [flam]oni, Cattio Sabino II Cornel(io) Anull[in]o co(n)s(ulibus), consensu concili universae prov(inciae) Baet(icae) decreti sunt honores quantos quisque maximos plurimosque flamen est consecutus cum statua. M. Fabius Basileus Celt(itanus) pater honor(e) accept(o) impens(a) remisit¹.

f) *Worship of living Emperors*

Before leaving this chronological table, there is one problem of the utmost importance for this investigation which should be treated here. I refer to the worship of the emperors during their lifetime. As has already been noticed, this form of the worship, prevalent in the East,

¹ Besides these inscriptions which can be assigned to definite emperors, we have a few which for various epigraphical reasons are placed in the first century A.D. : 2159, 2638, 3329, 3350, 4279, 6097.

was extremely rare in the West. Beaudouin¹ in his work *Le Culte des Empereurs dans les Cités de la Gaule Narbonnaise*, shows by a most conservative and rational elimination of many inscriptions which at first sight seem to relate to the worship of the emperors or others of the imperial household then living, that the number of such inscriptions in Gallia Narbonensis is extremely small. I shall endeavor to use equal caution in sifting the Spanish inscriptions, but even so, I think we shall find the number considerably larger than that in Gallia Narbonensis.

In the first place we have four inscriptions which from the indications of the list of offices belong beyond doubt to the lifetime of Augustus, and in which the word *sacrum* seems most simply and naturally explained as referring to some religious dedication to the living emperor. These are *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 504, No. 280; 2106, 2703, 5182² in the *Corpus*. One of these, No. 280, was found in 1896 near Bracara Augusta. It is a dedicatory inscription for an *ara* which seems to have been privately set up about 3/2 B.C. Another inscription, 2038³, from Anticaria in Baetica, unquestionably dates from the lifetime of Livia. It belongs after 14 A.D., when she became Iulia Augusta, and before 29 A.D., when she died. Still another, 194⁴, from Olisipo in Lusitania, seems to point to the worship of both Germanicus and Livia while alive⁵. Inscription 49⁶, which mentions a flamen of Tiberius, belongs with almost equal certainty to his lifetime, for it is unlikely that such an honor would be paid to that morose emperor after his death. On the other hand, he was most popular in the provinces during his life. Moreover, we know that a temple was erected to Tiberius in Asia Minor during his life⁷, and we have also an Italian inscription referring

¹ pp. 40-80.

² Cf. p. 105.

³ Cf. p. 106.

⁴ Cf. p. 106.

⁵ For the worship of Livia cf. also *CIL.* X, 7340, 7501, 7464. In Gaul we have two flaminicae of Livia under the name of Iulia Augusta, XII, 1363, 4249. There seems no reason why any flaminica should be instituted to Livia between the year 29 A.D. when she died and 42 A.D. when she was deified. On the other hand there is every reason why she should be worshipped in her lifetime since she had an enormous power in the earlier part of the reign of Tiberius after the death of Augustus. For Livia as *genetrix orbis* cf. Eckhel, *D. N.* VI, 154. For the worship of Germanicus cf. *CIL.* XII, 1872.

⁶ Cf. p. 106.

⁷ Tacitus, *ab excess.* 4, 15.

to a flamen of Tiberius¹. It is more natural to regard the inscription 2181, from Adamuz in Baetica, 28 A.D., as a religious dedication made by the *magister* of the *Lares Augustales*².

Very probably, although here it is dangerous to be too dogmatic, 1569, found at Ipsca in Baetica, date 46 A.D.³, refers to an image of Claudius raised in his lifetime as an object of worship⁴.

Before proceeding to a discussion of a few of the problems connected with the organization of the municipal priesthoods, I should naturally give a complete collection of these inscriptions arranged by cults, but since we already have an admirable collection of this sort in the article by Ciccotti, I shall proceed at once to this discussion.⁵

¹ *CIL.* IX, 688. Cf. *CIG.* 344; *CIA.* III, 456, 647; *CIL.* X, 688, and Beurlier, *l. c.* p. 169, n. 4.

² I omit here an inscription to the *Numen* of Tiberius, because this worship does not necessarily imply anything about the divinity of the person whose *numen* is worshipped.

³ Cf. Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 26. With this inscription may also be compared 1643, Iliturgicola in Baetica, 139–161 A.D., which beyond doubt refers to statues as objects of worship:

Statuae sac[rae] imperatoris Caesaris Tit[i] Aeli Hadriani Antonini Aug(usti) Pi[i] et M(arci) Aureli Veri Caesaris et [L(uci)] [Au]r[el]i Commodi Aug(usti), fil(i) Au[g](usti), C. Annius Prasius Ipolcobilculusis, Apueaclesis incola ob honorem seviratus.

⁴ It would be possible to increase this list materially by adding other inscriptions which probably refer to the imperial worship, but for which the evidence is less certain. I have preferred, however, to follow a conservative course.

⁵ I may, however, indicate here the additions which can now be made to Ciccotti's tables. On p. 3 of his article, 197 may be added under *Flamines assoluti*. On p. 7, 5848 may be inserted immediately after 3010, 6055 after 3860, 6150 and 6151 after 4524. On p. 8, under *Flamines bis*, 6014 after 3792. On same page, under *Flamines Perpetui*, 5617 gives a later rendering than 2479. On p. 9, under *Flamines Romae et Augusti*, 6147 gives a later rendering than 4516. On same page, insert 6097 after 4224. On p. 10, insert 6095, giving a *flamen* of *divus Vespasianus*, after 4217, and make 4274 follow 4212. On p. 12, add 5918 after 4276. On p. 13, insert 5513 after 1957. On p. 14, add 2149 *a* after 2132. On p. 15, cf. *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 390, for a suggested emendation of the reading *pontifex* to *flamen* in 5120. On p. 15, insert 5945 before 3369. On p. 16, change 2479 = 5617 to *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 356, No. 4: add 3361. On p. 17, add 6093 after 2638. On p. 19, add the inscription found in *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 382, No. 83, after 1471.

I. THE MUNICIPAL PRIESTHOODS

The first problem in considering the municipal priesthoods is the position of the simple flamines. Were they attached to the imperial worship or were they entirely devoted to the ceremonies of the municipalities? This is a difficult question to answer, because inscriptions, owing to the limitations of space, show a great variety of abbreviated and condensed expressions. It seems most reasonable to assume, however, that the simple term *flamen*, when applied to the municipal priests, indicates in abbreviated form some relation to the imperial worship. This view is supported by several facts. In the first place we know that the provincial flamens must have had charge of the cult of Rome and Augustus, because this was the sole provincial cult in existence¹. When, therefore, we find a provincial priest called simply *flamen*, we are forced to assume that this is a concise expression for some such title as *flamen Romae et Augusti(alicuius provinciae)*. If this is true of the provincial cult, we should expect similar abbreviated expressions to appear in the municipal cult also. In the second place we know that the worship of the emperor became *par excellence* the cult to which the provincials in municipalites, *conventus*, and capitals were devoted. It is, therefore, most natural to refer simple titles like *flamen*, *pontifex*, or *sacerdos* to the worship of the emperors. In the third place, whenever a fuller expression is used, which happens not infrequently, we find almost without exception that the reference is to some one of the imperial priesthoods. In Spain, for example, we have among the inscriptions of full form relating to the municipal flamens only two, 1663, *flamen coloniarum immunitum*, and 2105, *flamen sacrorum publicorum municipii*, which do not expressly refer to the worship of the emperors. The same remarks apply with nearly equal force to the terms *flaminicae*, *sacerdotes*, *pontifices*, but from the very nature of the office not to *augures*, *haruspices*, *salii*. Any evidence, therefore, which is offered by the inscriptions of *flamines*, *pontifices*, or *sacerdotes* of municipalities, may be accepted quite as readily as the testimony of less abbreviated inscriptions relating to the imperial cult.

¹ This is not a perfectly exact statement for Spain where the cult of the *divi* was combined in a quite exceptional fashion with that of Rome and Augustus. The principle of abbreviation, of course, is the same in Spain as elsewhere.

Having thus settled the status of a large number of inscriptions relating to the flamines and flaminicae we may proceed to consider a number of problems which arise regarding the position of the municipal flamines and flaminicae, their duties and privileges. In the first place we are met with the important question of the relationship between the flamines and flaminicae. Were the flaminicae the wives of the flamines? We know that at Rome the flaminica was the wife of the flamen dialis, and at first sight it would seem as if the flaminica of a provincial town should stand in a similar relationship. Still this parallelism is not so close as at first appears, for the municipal flaminica might be fairly said to bear a closer resemblance to the provincial flaminica. Since, however, this priestess also held her office by virtue of her husband's sacred functions, we should seem to have only another reason for believing that the position of the municipal flaminica was purely a subordinate one.

In at least two provinces, however, this seems not to have been the case. Hirschfeld¹ has shown that in Africa the municipal flaminica was elected, and for Gallia Narbonensis Beaudouin proves a similar condition with absolute success². Upon this problem in Spain, Ciccotti³ says (I paraphrase) : "Whether the flaminica would be such because wife of the flamen or independent of any sacerdotal office held by her husband, are questions which we cannot decide with much accuracy. . . . In 396, 397, the husband of a flaminica is called only flamen, and as his name does not occur elsewhere we cannot tell whether this was the only office he held. The data at hand will not allow us to decide whether every flaminica had her office because she was the wife of a flamen; but this bond of affinity which joins the flaminica and other persons invested with the sacerdotal office cannot be held to be something purely accidental." It seems to me that this note is very misleading. It is incorrect to adduce 396 and 397 as evidence for the marriage of the municipal flaminica and flamen, for the flamen mentioned in 396 is expressly called *flaminis provinciae Lusitaniae*. It is true that in 397 his wife is called flaminica, but since the wife of a

¹ *Sacerdoti municipali nell' Africa. Annali del Inst.*, 1886, p. 49.

² In defence of his position he quotes the following inscriptions: XII, 1904, 690, 1868, 2244, 3175, 4402, 3269.

³ *l. c.* p. 28.

provincial flamen, as we shall see later, held her position by virtue of her husband's, it is much more reasonable to suppose that the title flaminica here refers to a provincial office. It, therefore, seems unsafe to lay too much stress on the apparent analogy afforded by this inscription of a provincial flamen.

In fact, the slight evidence we have seems to point to a different conclusion from that advanced by Ciccotti. We have a certain number of inscriptions which rather tend to show that the flaminica was elected. If this be so, it is unreasonable to suppose that the election was purely a formal one, a legal fiction narrowing down the choice to the wife of the flamen. The first of these inscriptions relates not to a flaminica, but to a municipal sacerdos, whose office is expressly called annual: 3279. Castulo in Tarraconensis. Sacerdos annua aream ante templum Ro(mae) [et Augusti cum stat]uis de sua pecunia dedit item eo amplius ornamentis instruxit. If the female sacerdos were annual and, therefore, elective, we should naturally expect the flaminica to be elective also. Another inscription, 2188, is set up by Lucius Acilius Terentianus, a *duumvir*, to his parents, Lucius Acilius Barba and Acilia Lepidina, and his wife, Cornelia Lepidina, who is *flaminic(a) m(unicipii) S(aciliensis)*. The absence of the title flamen in this inscription, where the husband expressly calls himself *duumvir*, can hardly be due to a modest reticence, and is most naturally explained on the supposition that Terentianus did not hold that office. If this reasoning be correct, his wife would obtain the office of flaminica as the result of an election.

The evidence on this subject is then decidedly inconclusive, but the practise in the municipalities of neighboring provinces, the fact that the other municipal priesthoods were elective, and finally the fact that in no extant Spanish inscriptions do we have the husband of a flaminica expressly called flamen, make it rather more likely that the municipal flaminica, since she was elected by the community¹, held no necessary relation to the flamen. Having thus established the position of the municipal flaminica, we have next to consider the method by which the municipal flamen was elected and the length of his term of service.

¹ Of course the community was at perfect liberty to elect the wife of the municipal flamen to the post of flaminica if it chose to do so. That this sometimes happened is shown by *CIL*. VIII, 211.

At Rome the flamens were named by the pontifex maximus, the head of the state religion¹. We cannot, however, conclude from this that the municipal flamens were appointed by the head of the college of municipal pontiffs, for there seems to be no evidence that this official bore a position in the provincial municipalities analogous to that of the pontifex maximus at Rome. The municipal pontiffs and augurs were coöpted after an election by the comitia. This, however, affords no very close parallel for the flamens. In fact, by a process of elimination, we are driven to the conclusion that the election was by the town itself. This conclusion, moreover, is in accordance with the practise of the provincial cult, where the flamen of the province was nominated by the province². Our evidence is extremely fragmentary. 1570, found at Ipsca in Baetica, merely shows that the municipal pontifex was elected, though, of course, the analogy of this office must not be neglected in considering the municipal flamen. 5488, found at Cartima, speaks of a *sacerdos perpetua decreto decurionum Cartimitani facta*. This is important, for by analogy we should judge that the municipal flamen was elected by the decuriones. In point of fact, from the end of the second century municipal elections were in the hands of the decuriones³. This inscription, therefore, seems to fall after that period. Two other inscriptions from the completion of the municipal flamine prove conclusively that the office was elective. The first of these inscriptions, 2195, comes from Corduba in Baetica. It reads as follows :

Nemesi Cornelii Res[ti]tutus et African[us] exacto flamonio votum reddiderun[t].

The second, 2344, from Mellaria in Baetica, speaks of a Gaius Sempronius Speratus, who became *flamen divorum Augustorum* of the province of Baetica after having completed the office of *fetialis* and of flamen, *peracto honore flaminis et fecialis*. It would seem, therefore, that the municipal flamen was elected, but that we have no evidence as to the method of his election until the end of the second century.

¹ Bouché-Leclercq, *Manuel des Antiquités romaines*, p. 513, 514.

² Cf. *CIL*. II, 2344; Livy, *epitome*, 137; Tacitus, *ab excess.* I, 57, and p. 131 inf.

³ Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, I², p. 196.

Not only was the municipal flamine an elective office, but all the evidence would seem to show that it was held for a definite period, probably a year. At Rome the augurs, flamens, and pontiffs were named for life, but the provincial flamen held only an annual office¹. To prove that the office of municipal flamen was annual one must find²: (1) such expressions as *flamen iterum, bis, or ter*. These merely show that the office was temporary, but the higher the numerical adverb the more likely it is that the office was annual; (2) *flamonio functi*, who, if possible, afterwards exercise other duties incompatible with the flamine; (3) municipal flamens called *annui*. Applying these tests to Spain, we find five inscriptions of *flamines iterum* or *bis*, Nos. 34, 3792, 3864, 6014, and one inscription of a *flamen quartum*, No. 3571. This last inscription, found at Villajoyosa, seems to make the fact that the flamine was annual very certain, for it speaks of one Quintus Manlius Celsinus, who not only held the duumvirate three times, but the flamine as well four times. It is almost impossible to assume so extensive a career on any other basis than that of an annual flamine. We have two inscriptions which may be subjected to the second test. The first of these, 2195, clearly does not fulfill the condition that other offices should be held subsequently. The second, 2344, seems to me to be an exact parallel, for we can hardly conceive of a man being municipal and provincial flamen simultaneously. As to the third test, we do not find any municipal flamen called annual, but we do have in 3279 a *sacerdos annua*, a case which may furnish some analogy for the municipal flamine. It would seem, then, that we have good cumulative evidence to show that the municipal flamens were annual officers.

Having thus shown that the flamen was probably elected annually by the community, and having established the relation between the flamen and the flaminica, I shall next consider the position of the flamen in the *cursus honorum*.

In Africa the municipal priests are distinguished men. They are almost always *omnibus honoribus functi*³. Several later become *curatores*⁴, and many on leaving office enter the equestrian order⁵ or even

¹ Cf. *CIL*. II, 983, 4248, 2221, 2344.

² Cf. Beaudouin, *l. c.* p. 281 ff.

³ Cf. *CIL*. VIII, 6993, 7112, 8318, 8319, 9015, 9030, 9258, 9663.

⁴ Cf. *CIL*. VIII, 1298, 2243, 2409, 5358. ⁵ Cf. *CIL*. VIII, 2409.

become senators¹. In Gallia Narbonensis we find nobody who was raised to the equestrian or senatorial rank. We do find, however, that the municipal flamens were regularly selected from those who had previously exercised the highest municipal magistracy. Moreover, since the duumvirate was the highest of the city offices, mention of it often implies that the person was *omnibus honoribus functus*. It is difficult to say, however, whether the flamine came before or after the duumvirate. In Spain also we may fairly say that the municipal flamine was held by the leading men in the community, but it is difficult to determine whether it was higher or lower than the duumvirate, for although in a majority of the inscriptions the municipal flamens also hold the duumvirate, the administrative office sometimes precedes and sometimes follows the priestly one. The Spanish inscriptions may be conveniently divided into three groups: (a) those inscriptions in which the flamen had a municipal career; (b) those inscriptions in which a military career is noted, either alone or combined with the municipal career; (c) those inscriptions in which the flamen really enjoyed a considerable degree of prominence. Under the first class we find one inscription in which the flamen has held the aedileship alone, 3856, and one in which he held the aedileship and quaestorship, 4279. In the following he holds quaestorship, aedileship, and duumvirate: 3864, 3865, 4028, 4212, 4274. In 6147 the duumvirate and *praefectura fabrum*. The duumvirate alone is mentioned in these inscriptions, 34, 53, 194, 1074, 1941, 2105, 3008, 3179, 3276, 3277, 3620, 3623, 3789, 4217, 4267 (in two towns), 4520, 5523, 6014.

Under the second class we have flamens with a career entirely military as well as those with both military and municipal career. The following inscriptions come under this category: 1979, 2103, 3008 (also municipal), 4212, 4514, 4622 (also municipal), 6097.

The following inscriptions relate to men whose extended services justify the use of our modern title 'distinguished citizens'. Here may be mentioned two inscriptions to men who had wide experience: 2132 is to Marcus Valerius who was *duumvir*, *legatus perpetuus municipii Pontificiensis*, *praefectus fabrum*, *flamen*, *pontifex Augusti*; 3571 is to Quintus Manlius who was *duumvir* three times and flamen four times.

¹ Cf. *CIL*. VIII, 7041.

Then we have a number of inscriptions in which the flamens were persons who had served in the preliminary equestrian career or its equivalent either throughout or in part. These are the following: 2103, 4224, 4264, 4514, 6150. We have no inscriptions in which a flamen is of senatorial rank, but several of flamens who attained equestrian rank either by the direct gift of the emperor or by holding prefectships or procuratorship. To the former class belong 4211, in which we learn that L. Domitius Dentonianus was *equo publico per Traianum*, and 6095, in which L. Fonteius is *equo publico donatus ab imperatore Nerva Augusto*. To the latter class belong 1534, in which P. Aelius Fabianus is *praefectus* of Gaius Caesar (Caligula); 5617, in which an unknown person is *curator divi Titi* in Baetica, procurator of Gallaecia, prefect of the fiscus in Germany. These inscriptions prove beyond doubt that the office of municipal flamen was one of the most honorable in the *cursus honorum*¹, and that the most influential men in provincial towns gladly held it.

Owing to the importance which the worship of the emperors attained in the provinces, the flamine gradually overshadowed the other municipal priesthoods, since it was the flamen who was *par excellence* the representative of the imperial religion.

The distribution of the pontifices and sacerdotes in the various provinces is a question not without interest. We have only one example of a pontifex in Lusitania. In Tarraconensis we have 9 *pontifices*, 2 *pontifices perpetui*, 1 *pontifex divorum et Augustorum*, 1 *pontifex Caesaris*; 13 officials in all. In Baetica we have 13 *pontifices*, 6 *pontifices perpetui*, 4 *pontifices Augusti* or *Augustorum*, 2 *pontifices divi Augusti*, 2 *pontifices domus Augustae*, 3 *pontifices Caesarum*. This is a total of 30. We need not be surprised at finding so few pontifices in Lusitania, a province which was in a much more backward condition than either Baetica or Tarraconensis. It is rather striking, however, to find the pontifices in Baetica so much more numerous than in Tarraconensis. The distribution of the sacerdotes shows this same result in an even more remarkable manner. We have no sacerdotes in Lusitania. In Tarraconensis we have 4 *sacerdotes Romae et Augusti*, and 3 priestesses called simply *sacerdotes*. This makes a total of 7 officials. When we

¹ Cf. Hirschfeld, p. 53, for Africa.

turn to Baetica we meet only one male *sacerdos*, but we have 4 female *sacerdotes*, 4 *sacerdotes perpetuae*, 1 *sacerdos perpetua Augustae*, and 4 *sacerdotes divae Augustae*. The fact that we have only one man called *sacerdos* is probably to be explained on the supposition that it was far more common in this province to reserve the title *sacerdos* for women. *Pontifex*, as the large number of inscriptions in Baetica show, was the title commonly assumed by men. The cause for the difference between the cults of Baetica and of Tarraconensis will best be seen by a comparison of the number of flamens in the two provinces. In Baetica we have 7 *flamines*, 2 *flamines perpetui*, 2 *flamines Augusti*, 5 *flamines divi Augusti* or *Augustorum*, 1 *flamen coloniarum immunium*, 1 *flamen sacrorum publicorum*, making 18 officials called flamines. In Tarraconensis we have 24 *flamines*, 3 *flamines perpetui*, 4 *flamines Augusti* or *Augustorum*, 11 *flamines Romae et Augusti*, 5 flamines of special emperors. This makes a total of 47 officers called flamines. Of course this shows a far greater development of the cult in Tarraconensis, but it also shows that the cult in Tarraconensis was conducted by flamens, for we have 47 flamens against 30 pontiffs and only 18 flamens in Baetica.

What is the cause of this phenomenon? In the first place the pontifices and sacerdotes much more than the flamines conducted other worships than that of the emperors. Thus we find no flamen specifically assigned to any other worship. On the other hand, we have several inscriptions relating to pontifices or sacerdotes expressly assigned to other cults¹. For example, 1929 speaks of a priest of Hercules, 2126 of a priest to the genius of the municipality, 4312 to Apollo, 4310 to Caelestis, 2231 to Venus. To assume, therefore, that the pontifices and sacerdotes merely added to their previous duties in connection with the worship of the municipalities some participation in the ceremonial of imperial worship, while the flamines, certainly of later origin, were established for the express purpose of furthering the new religion, is an interesting and rather plausible hypothesis. In the second place the flamine, the peculiar priesthood of the imperial worship, was not introduced into Baetica until a considerably later period than its introduction into Tarraconensis. The cult of the

¹ Cf. Ciccotti, p. 16.

emperors before the appearance of the flaminiate was, therefore, conducted by the pontifices and sacerdotes. Even at a later period the flaminiate never attained the high state of development which it reached in Tarraconensis, and the pontifices and sacerdotes continued to exercise here many of the duties which elsewhere fell to the lot of flamines and flaminicae. In view of this state of affairs we are not surprised to find that the *lex Coloniae Genetivae* which mentions *pontifices* and *sacerdotes* with considerable detail has no reference to *flamines*. So also the existence of *pontifices Caesarum*, confined practically to Baetica and apparently of an early date, shows an organization which discharged many of the duties elsewhere exercised by *flamines Romae et Augusti* or *Romae et divorum Augustorum* or by *flamines* with similar titles.

We have 10 inscriptions of *Pontifices Caesarum* or similar titles: 2038, 2039, 2040, 2149 A, 2342, 2115, 1380, 5120, 3350, 3362. All of these except two are in Baetica. No. 3350 is really on the border, while 3362 is in Tarraconensis. As has been noticed¹, three of these inscriptions, found at Anticaria, can be dated in the reign of Tiberius. Since one of them is to Julia Augusta, one to Germanicus, and one probably to Drusus, the supposition seems not unreasonable that, at Anticaria at least, the cult of which these *pontifices Caesarum* were the representatives was something very like the germ of the later worship of the Domus Divina. Another of the inscriptions which speaks of a *pontifex divi Augusti*, 5120, can be dated in the reign of Caligula; 3350 also would seem to be of early date, not only from the form of the letters, but perhaps also because Gaius Cornelius is called *pontifex Caesaris primus*². Marcus Herennius *pontifex Augustorum* of 2342 could hardly have flourished before the accession of Caligula if we may judge anything from the plural form, though how much later he may have lived it would be impossible to say. There is no clue to the date of the other inscriptions referring to the pontifices attached to the imperial cult, but on the other hand, there is nothing to contradict their early origin. The fact that out of ten inscriptions, five, an unusually large proportion, can be pretty definitely assigned to the period from

¹ Cf. pp. 106 and 107.

² Perhaps, however, *primus* has here merely an honorary sense. Cf. p. 138.

14-41 A.D. makes it an attractive and rather plausible supposition that most of the remaining inscriptions were of early date also. If pontifices undertook the cult, we should expect in accordance with the Roman idea which placed the flamen under the service of a special divinity, but gave to the pontifex the general right of supervision and participation in all the religious interests of the state, that the worship of the emperors would be only one of the functions of the municipal pontifices. The greater variety of functions which we have already found¹ assigned to these pontifices, as compared with the flamines, goes far to confirm this theory.

An attempt to establish a further relation between the three greater municipal priesthoods would be perhaps a thankless task. Like the flamine, the pontificate was also a temporary elective office, probably annual². The same may be said of the sacerdotes with even greater certainty³. The pontificate and the flamine are joined in a number of inscriptions (55, 1475, 1534, 1663, 2105, 2132, 3362, 5523, 5617), but it seems almost impossible to tell which of the two offices was the more important in Baetica, though in Tarraconensis the flamen was obviously the person of greater dignity.

Besides the obvious duty of officiating at the imperial worship, the municipal priests had certain other privileges and obligations which perhaps deserve special mention. In the first place, as we learn from the *Lex Coloniae Genetivae*⁴, they had seats of special honor at public games, and wore as a distinguishing badge of their priestly functions the *toga praetexta*. Special honors might be paid individual priests for particular services to their municipalities or as a recognition of their general merit. The case of Sextus Allius Mamercus of Astigi in Baetica is perhaps the best example. 1475 : Sex(to) Allio Mamercus, pontifici perpetuo Col(oniae) Astigitanae et flamini divor(um) August(orum)

¹ Cf. p. 120.

² We hear of Marcus Clodius, a *pontifex designatus* at Ipsca, of Marcus Marius, a *pontificalis* at Acinipo. Cf. Nos. 1570 and 1348.

³ We have an example of a *sacerdos annua* at Castulo, 3279, and examples of *sacerdotes* who afterwards became provincial priests exactly like the municipal flamens, and who must therefore have been temporary officers: 2637, 2638, 6093; *Revue Arch.*, vol. XXXI, p. 441.

⁴ II, 5-10, quoted by Ciccotti, p. 42, on this privilege.

concili Immunes Ilienses Ilipenses decuriones viritim statuam d(ederunt) d(edicaverunt). Another inscription speaks of the services of Marcus Clodius to his native city. 5837: Labitolosa in Tarraconensis. M(arco) Clodio M(arci) f(ilio) Gal(eria) Flacco, IIviro bis, flamini, tribuno militum legionis III . . . Flaviae, viro praestantissimo et civi optimo ob plurima erga rem p(ublicam) suam merita cives Labitolosani et incolae. Other inscriptions of similar import are 1188, 2132, 3710, 4610.

The evidence as to the burdens of the municipal priests is both fuller and more explicit. In the first place, the *lex Coloniae Genetivae*¹ orders that the pontiffs and augurs shall have a house in the colony at a distance of not more than a mile from the city in order that the community may have a pledge that they will carry out their official duties. In the second place, we find from the inscriptions of African municipal priests that definite sums of money must be paid on the assumption of the priestly function. This sum, the *legitima honoraria*, might be expended in various ways. In Spain we cannot prove that there was any such legal obligation as existed in Africa, but there was unquestionably a moral obligation amounting to a well-established precedent that the municipal priests should give certain sums of money for the benefit of the public.

These favors to the municipality might take the forms of vows paid when the flamine was conferred, or of gifts made *ob honorem flamoni* or *in honore pontificatus*. Thus, at Barbesula, Sextus Fulvius Lepidus gave an *aedicula* in accordance with such a vow, 1939. At Urgavo, Gaius Venaecius Voconianus raised two statues, one to Fortuna, the other to Mercury, in accordance with a similar vow². Another vow is recorded as paid by Restitutus and Africanus, at Corduba, *exacto flamonio*³. A gift was made by Lucius Calpurnius Silvanus, at Urgavo, *ob honorem pontificatus*, 2105. Similar gifts *ob honorem flamoni* are recorded in an inscription from Lacippo as made by Gaius Marcius Cephalo, 1936. We find also examples of *ludi scaenici*, *ludi circenses*, and banquets given to the people by flamines, flaminicae, and pontifices. At Tucci in Baetica we have an interesting inscription of Lucius Lucretius Fulvianus, 1663:

¹ Cf. I, 1-7.

² *CIL.* II, 2103.

³ *CIL.* II, 2195.

Lucius Lucretius Fulvianus flamen col(oniarum) immuniū provin-
ciae Baetic(ae), pontifex perpetuus domus Aug(ustae) t(estamento)
p(oni) i(ussit) ex arg(enti) p(ondo) ob honor(em) pontificatus,
Lucretia L(uci) f(ilia) Campana, flam(inica) perp(etua) domus
Aug(ustae), editis ad dedicationem scaenicis ludis per quadriduum et
circensibus et epulo diviso posuit. Huic dono Lucr(etia) Campana
amplius nomine suo coronam auream adiunxit.

At Isturgi in Baetica, Aulus Terentius, a pontifex, raises a statue to
Mars Augustus after having given *ludi scaenici*¹. At Astigi, Aponia
Montana, a *sacerdos divorum Augustorum*, gives circensian and other
games *ob honorem sacerdoti*². We hear of two women, Patricia at Ili-
berris³, and Postumia Honorata at Ocurri, who gave banquets to the
people⁴. Edifices of various sorts were constructed at the expense
of these priests and priestesses and given to the city. Since such
inscriptions afford the best illustration of the lavish expenditures which
were demanded of the municipal priests, it will be well to give a few
examples:

1956. Cartima in Baetica.

Iunia D(ecimi) f(ilia) Rustica, sacerdos perpetua et prima in muni-
cipio Cartimitano, porticus public(as), vetustate corruptas refecit, solum
balinei dedit, vectigalia publica vindicavit, signum aereum Martis in
foro posuit, porticus ad balineum solo suo cum piscina et signo Cupidi-
nis, epulo dato et spectaculis editis d(e) p(ecunia) s(ua) d(edit)
d(edicavit): statuas sibi et G(aio) Fabio Iuniano f(ilio) suo ab ordine
Cartimitanorum decretas remissa impensa, item statuam G(aio) Fabio
Fabiano viro suo d(e) p(ecunia) s(ua) f(actus) dedit.

1957. Cartima in Baetica.

L(ucio) Porcio Quirina Saturnino pontifici qui pro hon(ore) sester-
tium viginti (milia) n(ummum) d(edit) ut aes alien(um) rei p(ublicae)
Cartimitan(ae) lib(eraret) amici fac(iendum) curaverunt. L(ucius)
Porcius Quirina Saturninus h(onore) a(ccepto) i(mpensam) r(emisit).

2782. Clunia in Tarraconensis⁵.

G(aio) Calvisio Alionis f(ilio) Gal(eria) Sabino, mag(istro), flamini

¹ *CIL*. II, 2121.

⁴ *CIL*. II, 1338; cf. also 1074, 1956, 2098.

² *CIL*. II, 1471; cf. 1663.

⁵ Cf. *CIL*. IX, 4686, also.

³ *CIL*. II, 5514.

Romae et divi Aug(usti) quod populo frumentum annona cara dedit amici.

At Barcino we have the following interesting provision from the will of Lucius Caecilius Optatus (4514) :

. . . do, lego darique volo denariorum septem milia quingentos ex quorum usuris semessibus edi volo quodannis spectac(ulum) pugilum die IIII iduum Iuni(arum) usque at denarios CCL (ducentos quinquaginta), et eadem die ex denariis CC (ducentis) oleum in thermas public(as) populo praeberi et [l]ecta praestari ea condicione volo, ut liberti mei item libertorum meorum libertarumque liberti quos honor seviratus contigerit ab omnibus muneribus excusati sint. Quot si quis eorum at munera vocatus fuerit, tum ea denariorum septem milia quingentos at rem publicam Tarrac(onensem) transferri iubeo sub eadem forma spectaculorum quot s(upra) s(criptum) est, edendorum Tarracone¹.

Before leaving the municipal priesthoods we have still to speak of a number of minor cults. Here also may conveniently be placed those inscriptions which, although not belonging definitely to the records of any priestly organization, yet refer clearly to the worship of the emperors. Under the former class are several important inscriptions referring to the *sodales Augustales* from Salpensa (1283), Callenses (1371), Cabeza del Griego (3114 and 5879), Barcino (4508 and 4509).

The *sodales Augustales*, as has been shown by Dessau², were a college modelled after the *sodales Titii* to carry on the ancestral rites of the Julian gens which after the death of Augustus became a part of the state religion. The great dignity of the office is shown by the fact that the *sodales Augustales* are classed with the great colleges³. These *sodales*, therefore, were men of the highest position in the state ; hence we are not surprised to find many persons who have enjoyed a long official career holding this priesthood in Spain.

Another interesting manifestation of the imperial worship appears in

¹ Compare also on this subject of the public munificence of municipal priests and priestesses the following interesting inscriptions: *CIL.* II, 1074, 1570, 1649, 2098, 2129.

² *Ephem. epig.* 3, p. 205 ff.

³ Cf. Tacitus, *ab excess.* 3, 64, and Dio Cassius, 58, 12.

the series of inscriptions treating of the *Domus Divina*, or the *Domus Augusta*, as it was called at an earlier period¹. These inscriptions apparently refer to the worship of the reigning imperial family.

This is not the place to speak of the reorganization of the cult of the *Lares Compitales* by the association with these deities of the image of Augustus, which resulted in the worship of the Lares and the genius of Augustus under the name of *Lares Augustales*². We have a number of Spanish inscriptions upon this subject, and here, as at Rome, the cult is administered by the humbler classes. So many *seviri Augustales*³ appear as *magister Larum* that the coincidence of offices can hardly be considered accidental. In other words, these inscriptions seem to show that in Spain at least the *seviri Augustales* were in some way connected with the cult of the *Lares Publici*. We have also several inscriptions of the *Lares Augustales* alone⁴. Finally, we have a most interesting inscription set up by one of those semi-public corporations which must have been important factors in spreading the worship of the emperors, and were perhaps sources of the *seviri Augustales*⁵:

5929. Carthago Nova in Tarraconensis.

G(aio) Laetilio M(arci) f(ilio) A[palo], II vir(o) quinq(uennali) Lares Augustales et Mercurium piscatores et propolae de pecun(ia) sua f(aciendum) c(uraverunt) i(dem)q(ue) p(robarunt).

This guild was perhaps similar to that described in another inscription⁶:

2573. Lucus Augusti in Tarraconensis.

Sacrum Poemanae, collegium divi Aug(usti).

There remain the few inscriptions which clearly refer to the worship of the emperors, but which cannot be assigned to any particular priestly

¹ Cf. *CIL.* II, 1678, 1978, 2105, 3221, 3531, 5354. In 1663 we hear of a *pontifex perpetuus domus Augustae*. According to the view of Mommsen the inscriptions of the *pontifices Caesarum* are very similar to those of the *Domus Augusta*.

² The best account of this subject may be found in Boissier, *La Religion romaine*, vol. I, chap. III.

³ Cf. *CIL.* II, 4293, 4297, 4304, 4306, 4307, 4290. In the last three of these inscriptions *magister* is probably only an abbreviation for *magister Larum*.

⁴ Cf. *CIL.* II, 1133, 2013, 2181, 2233, 3113.

⁵ Cf. *CIL.* XIV, 409.

⁶ Cf. *CIL.* X, 1238, on the *Cultores Augusti* at Nola, and also *CIL.* VIII, 5523.

organization. In the first place we have a number of dedicatory inscriptions. One of these probably refers to the time of Augustus :

3555. Ilici in Tarraconensis.

Augusto divi f(ilio) G(aius) Maecius G(aii) f(ilius) Celer dedit dedicavit.

Two refer to some unknown emperor, whether or not Augustus we cannot say, for every emperor took that title :

471. Emerita in Lusitania.

Aug(usto) sacr(um).

2197. Corduba in Baetica.

Augusto sacrum.

Another which refers to the emperor Aurelian may have been set up in his lifetime, though there is no definite evidence in the inscription itself¹ :

3832. Saguntum in Tarraconensis.

Deo Aureliano.

A most important inscription from Pons Alcantarensis records the dedication of a temple and a bridge to the emperor Trajan :

761. Pons Alcantarensis in Lusitania.

Imperatorī Nervae Traiano Caesari Augusto Germanico Dacico sacrum. Then follow some elegiac couplets of which the following are important :

Templum in rupe Tagi superis et Caesare plenum
Ars ubi materia vincitur ipsa sua.

.

Idem Romuleis templum cum Caesare divis
Constituit ; felix utraque causa sacri.

Recently there was found at Tarraco a small bell with the following inscription² :

Cacabulus sacris Augustis, Vernaclus, nuntius maior. Seculum bonum s(enatui) p(opulo)q(ue) R(omano) [et populo Romano], felix Tarraco.

It seems most reasonable to believe that this bell, judging from its

¹ Cf. *CIL.* X, 1271, 3903, l. 5; XI, 556. Cohen, *Monn. Imp.* VI, p. 197.

² Cf. *Eph. Epig.* vol. VIII, p. 447, No 198.

small size, was a votive offering made by some slave attached to the provincial cult of *Romae divorum et Augustorum* at Tarraco¹.

Secondly, we have a number of inscriptions referring to the *genius* or the *numen* of the emperor. The fact that many of these inscriptions are assigned to the lifetime of the emperors does not necessarily imply a personal worship. "The *genius* is the spiritual part of the man, by which he exists. The *genius* of the ordinary citizen is sometimes worshipped, that of the master by the slaves for instance, but this does not make the man himself divine"². In fact, according to the Roman conception, almost everything had a *genius*; towns, camps, military centuries, colleges, tax-gathering, public granaries³. As used in inscriptions the conception of the *numen* closely approximates to that of the *genius*. As Beaudouin well says: "The *numen* of an emperor is his power, grandeur, sovereign will, as opposed to his personality"⁴. The introduction of the *genius* of the living emperor into oaths has already been noticed in an inscription of Malaca, where the formula is "per Iovem et divom Augustum et divum Claudium et divom Vespasianum Aug(ustum) et divom Titum Aug(ustum) et Genium imp(eratoris) Caesaris Domitiani"⁵. In an inscription found at Italica (1133), the *genius Caesaris Augusti* is associated with the *Lares Publici*. In another inscription we have simply the words *Genio Augusti*. This inscription (5123) was found at Bracara Augusta. We have two inscriptions relating to the *numen* of emperors. The first of these evidently belongs to the lifetime of Tiberius:

1516. Ipagrum in Baetica.

Numini Ti(beri) Caesaris Augusti Flaccus Fidentinus.

The second is even more interesting, as suggesting the religious origin of the purely formal phrase, "*Numini Maiestatique eorum*", so common at a later period.

2009. Nescania in Baetica.

Numini divorum Augustorum G(aius) Publicius Fortunatus liber[t]us m(unicipii) F(lavii) Nescan[niensis] aram solo pub(lico) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(onum) d(edit) d(edicavit).

¹ For the various views of scholars on this interesting inscription cf. Huebner, *l. c.*

² Cf. Beaudouin, p. 45; also Beurlier, p. 45 ff.

³ Cf. Beaudouin, p. 45.

⁴ Beaudouin, p. 48.

⁵ Cf. *CIG.* 1933; Apuleius, *Met.* 9, 41 In general, Beurlier, p. 43.

II. THE CONVENTUAL CULT

The *sacerdotium conventus* seems to have occupied a somewhat anomalous position, but was perhaps an honor midway between the municipal and the provincial priesthood. It was not, however, at all necessary for a man to pass through this stage in order to attain the provincial priesthood; on the contrary, we usually find the succession made directly from the municipal to the provincial office. We have a very few inscriptions from Tarraconensis relating to this organization, which has no precise parallel in any other province¹.

III. THE PROVINCIAL CULT

So much work has already been done on the provincial cult, and its general nature is so well understood that a summary treatment will suffice. In the first place it is obvious that the provincial priesthood, by whatever title it went, was a far more important post than any of the municipal priesthoods. In most provinces the provincial priest, under whatever title he served, was always a priest of Rome and Augustus since this was the sole provincial cult in existence². In the priestly organizations of the municipalities, on the other hand, the worship of the *divi* played an important part and the cult was of a much more personal nature, though Huebner seems to be wrong in assuming that the cult of Rome and Augustus was absolutely reserved for the provinces³.

Under this head of the provincial cult the following questions seem to call for consideration: (*a*) the association of the worship of the *divi* with that of Rome and Augustus, a peculiarity of the Spanish provincial cult; (*b*) the position of the provincial flaminica as compared with that of the municipal flaminica; (*c*) the method by which the provincial

¹ Cf. Beurlier, p. 153 and 154. Since no new inscriptions have been found since the publication of Ciccotti's article, a reference to his collection, pp. 44 and 45, seems sufficient.

² Cf. Beaudouin, p. 257.

³ Cf. Huebner, *CIL*. II, 4224. Beurlier, who (p. 168, note 4) refers to a number of municipal inscriptions relating to the cult of Rome and Augustus, makes the plausible suggestion that the municipal cult was at first influenced, like the provincial cult, by the efforts of Augustus to have his name adored only when associated with the goddess Roma.

flamen was elected; (*d*) the composition of the *concilium* with some consideration of its prerogatives. Much has already been written upon most of these points, but for the sake of completeness it seems unwise to omit all consideration of them. They may, however, be treated in summary fashion, especially the last topic, upon which the excellent work of Guiraud, *Les Assemblées Provinciales dans L' Empire Romain*, furnishes an exhaustive treatment.

a) The provincial cult of Spain assumes an entirely exceptional character from the association of the *divi* with the worship of Rome and Augustus, a peculiarity which modifies the line of demarcation observable in other provinces. Thus in Tarraconensis, where the cult attained its widest development, we have *flamines Romae divorum et Augustorum provinciae*, *flamines divorum et Augustorum provinciae*, *flamines divorum Augustorum provinciae*, *flamines Augustorum provinciae*, *flamines August(i) provinciae*, *flamines Romae et Augusti provinciae*. In Baetica we have *flamines divorum Augustorum*. In Lusitania we have a *flamen divi Augusti*. In all of these provinces we have simple flamines, an abbreviated form of expression which represents the same functions I have enumerated above at greater length. The only other country where similar duties are assumed by the provincial priest is Sardinia, where we have a provincial *flamen divorum Augustorum*¹. Hirschfeld is doubtless correct in his conjecture that the peculiar position of Spain, or more especially of the province of Tarraconensis, is due to the early consecration of the temple to *divus Augustus* at the capital Tarraco, an event which must have exercised an important influence upon the cult of Rome and Augustus². Certainly the worship in the Spanish provinces was fundamentally that of Rome and Augustus with a slight local modification resulting from the worship of the *divi*, rather than that of the *divi imperatores* as the main stock into which the cult of Rome and Augustus is subsequently grafted. Beurlier³ seems to prove conclusively that it is not a question of two distinct cults discharged by the same priests, but the coalescence of the cult of the *divi* with that of Rome and Augustus.

¹ *CIL*. X, 7599.

² *Zur Geschichte des römischen Kaisercultus*, p. 849.

³ *Le Culte Impérial*, p. 101.

As the list of inscriptions referring to the provincial cult given by Ciccotti is very satisfactory¹, I proceed at once to the discussion of the provincial priesthoods.

b) It seems certain that in Tarraconensis the provincial flaminica was the wife of the provincial flamen. This is proved by the following inscriptions: 4198, 4236 (cf. also 4257 for the husband), 4241, 4242, 4246, 4252² (cf. also 4263 for the husband). Another inscription, 4246: Semproniae Fusci f(iliae) Placidiae Pompaelonensi flaminicae consensu concili P. H. C. C. Cornelius Valens maritus sua pecunia fecit, probably implies, not as Ciccotti supposes that there was need of previous consideration on the part of the *concilium*, but rather that the statue to which this honorary inscription belongs was set up by the husband with the approval of the *concilium*³. In Lusitania also (cf. 396 and 397) the same relationship existed between the flamen and the flaminica. Though we have no definite evidence upon this subject in Baetica, the analogy of the neighboring provinces of Africa and of Gallia Narbonensis as well as that of the other Spanish provinces would lead us to infer the prevalence of the same rule.

c) The fact that we hear of *flamines designati* in three inscriptions, 2220, 4196, 5124, proves merely that the provincial flamine was an elective office, but shows nothing as to the form of election. Similarly the title *flaminales* connotes election. Thus, in 4248, a statue is decreed to C. Valerius Arabinus: ob curam tabulari censualis fideliter administr(atam) statuam inter flaminales viros positam exornand[a]m universi censuer(unt). In 983, C. Varinius is called *pientissimus vir flaminialis provinciae Baeticae*. The inscriptions of *flamines designati* imply that an interval elapsed between the election and the inaugura-

¹ The following additions should be made, however. On p. 46, add 396 and 5264 after 336. On p. 47, *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 385, No. 89, gives a later reading for 983. On p. 52, add after 4221, 6093, 6094, 6095, 6150, *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 449, No. 199, and after 4225 add 4224. On p. 53, after 4199 add 4217. On p. 54, insert 5124 after 4258 under the heading 8) *flamen designatus provinciae*.

² In 3329, Manlia Silana is probably the wife of Postumius Fabullus since the two are associated in the same gift.

³ We find only two cases in which it cannot be proved that the husband of the flaminica thus mentioned was a flamen (4190 and 4233). Perhaps we may suppose that the omission of the title in these cases is due to a modest reticence.

tion. Iteration was apparently not allowed, for we have no instances of *flamines bis*. It is difficult to say absolutely what the duration of the office was, but it was probably annual. In the first place the analogy of the municipal priesthoods must have reacted upon the provincial cult, especially as many of the provincial priests had previously been municipal priests. Second, the great number of inscriptions from Tarraco relating to the provincial cult and the fact that so many different towns were represented suggest a short term of service. The *concilium*, which, as we shall see, elected the flamens, had the right of praising or blaming the provincial governors¹, a privilege which would have been of little value if the meetings had not been annual². Finally, in the law of Narbo³ the provincial flamens are expressly called annual: [omniaque secundum hanc legem per reliquam] partem eius anni eo ordine habeto quo annuorum flami[um habentur].

The provincial flamen was elected by the *concilium* of the province. This is proved by two inscriptions⁴:

2221. At Corduba in Baetica.

[Fabio M. f. Galeria] . . . Do [flam]ini divorum Aug(ustorum) provinciae Baet[icae] huic consummato hono[re] [flam]oni Cattio Sabino II, Cornel(io) Anull[in]o co[n]s(ulibus) consensu concili universae prov(inciae) Baet(icae) decreti sunt honores quantos quisque maximos plurimosque flamen est consecutus cum statua.

2344. Mellaria in Baetica.

C. Sempronio Sperato flamini divorum Aug(ustorum) provinciae Baeticae, imp(eratore) Nerva Traiano Caes(are) Aug(usto) Ger(manico) III, Vicerio Alariano et L. Marcio Postumo co[n]s(ulibus). Hic provinciae Baeticae consensu flamini[s] munus et consequutus, peracto honore flamini(s) et feciali(s) omn(e) concil(ium) et consensus statuam decrevit.

d) This *concilium* was composed of delegates belonging to the order of the decuriones sent from colonies with Roman or Latin rights, and

¹ Tacitus, *ab excess.* 15, 22.

² Cf. Marq. *eph. epig.* I, p. 214. Cf. Guiraud, *Les Assemblées provinciales*, pp. 76-81.

³ Cf. *CIL.* XII, 6038, line 20.

⁴ Cf. *CIL.* X, 7518, for Sardinia. For the three Gauls, Livy, *eph.* 137, and Allmer, *Inscr. antiq. du musée de Lyon*, II, p. 91; also Beurlier, p. 137.

from *municipia*¹. It probably met once a year and elected the *flamen provinciae* for the ensuing year. It also made provision for the maintenance of the worship, and for the suitable recognition of the services of flamens by the erection of statues or some other marks of honor. Since a meeting of men so prominent in the provinces could hardly be expected to confine itself to purely religious duties, we are not surprised to find these *concilia* passing resolutions of thanks to retiring governors and sometimes adopting motions of censure². The political powers of these *concilia*, which have been considered at length by Guiraud, fall without the scope of this article³.

To become a provincial flamen was the crowning honor in the career of the provincial. This is well illustrated in the case of the Spanish provinces where we hear of 28 men who had attained the highest municipal honors before gaining this priesthood⁴. Many of the holders were men of equestrian rank or men raised to the equestrian rank by grant of the emperor; not a few had attained prefectures or procuratorships⁵. In six cases the titles of municipal or conventual priesthoods previously held are expressly mentioned⁶. In only a few inscriptions do we hear of provincial priests who have held no other office⁷. Huebner holds that the omission of other offices may in some of these cases be due to modesty or brevity. Ciccotti, on the other hand, points out that certain provisions of the *Codex Theodosianus*, which are intended to secure an established *cursus honorum* for all provincial priests, suggest the inference that the regular rule must have been

¹ Cf. Ciccotti, p. 60; Guiraud, *Les Assemblées Provinciales dans L'Empire Romain*, p. 61-69.

² Cf. Tacitus, *ab excess.* 15, 20 and 21.

³ Cf. *l. c.* p. 112-217 especially.

⁴ *Omnibus honoribus in re publica sua functus*, 3584, 4189, 4191, 4195, 4197, 4200, 4203, 4204, 4205, 4207, 4209, 4213, 4218, 4223, 4227, 4229, 4230, 4231, 4232, 4237, 4244, 4247, 4249, 4251, 4254, 4257, 6093, *Revue Arch.* vol. XXXI, p. 441.

⁵ Cf. the list made by Huebner, *CIL.* II, p. 541, to which should be added 6095, *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 449, No. 199.

⁶ 4215, 4223, 5124, 6093, 6094, *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 449, No. 199. Doubtless the municipal priesthoods are often included in the comprehensive phrase, *omnibus honoribus in re publica sua functus*.

⁷ Huebner mentions 4193, 4214, 4220, 4228, 4235, 4243, 4250, 4255.

disregarded by the admission to the provincial flaminiate of persons who had never held other offices. It seems, however, that this point is not very well taken, for the *Codex Theodosianus* dates from the year 438 A.D. and its provisions are not especially applicable to a series of inscriptions which with Huebner may be assigned to the first, the second, and the beginning of the third century. The two most important duties of the provincial flamen were to preside at the meeting of the *concilium* and to conduct the worship of the imperial cult before the provincial altar or temple.

A word should be said in closing¹ on the introduction of the imperial worship into the three Spanish provinces. We know from a passage in Quintilian² that there was an altar sacred to Augustus at Tarraco during his reign: *Augustus nuntiantibus Tarraconensibus palmam in ara eius enatam 'apparet', inquit, 'quam saepe accendatis'*. This altar is also represented by coins with a palm growing out of it³. Under the reign of Tiberius a temple was constructed here in the year 15 A.D. at the request of the provincials. Tacitus says on this subject in the

¹ It will be noticed that I have given in this article no discussion of the position of the *flamines perpetui* and other priestly officials to whom this title is applied. I make this omission from the conviction that this question can be satisfactorily discussed only in connection with the use of that title furnished by the *Seviri Augustales*, whose duties I have not included here.

² Quintilian, 6, 3, 77.

³ Cf. Eckhel, I, 57; Mionnet, I, p. 36, n. 260, p. 51, n. 370-374; Dio Cassius, 53, 25. In general, the erection of altars seems to have preceded the building of temples. Thus, according to Hirschfeld (*Zur Geschichte des römischen Kaisercultus*, p. 839), the provincial cult was introduced into the West by Drusus on the first of August of the year 12 B.C. Cf. Livy, *epit.* 139: *Ara divi Caesaris ad confluentem Araris et Rhodani dedicata sacerdote creato C. Iulio Vercondaridubno Aeduo*. Dio Cass. 54, 32: *προφάσει τῆς ἐορτῆς ἣν καὶ νῦν περὶ τὸν τοῦ Αὐγούστου βωμὸν ἐν Λουγδούνῳ τελοῦσι*. Suet. *Claud.* 2: *Claudius natus est Iulio Antonio Fabio Africano cons. Kal Aug. Lugduni, eo ipso die quo primum ara ibi Augusto dedicata est*. Cf. also Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, I³, p. 269. The *ara Vbiorum* at Cologne was modelled on the *ara Lugdunensis*. At this, in the year 9 A.D., a Cheruscan was priest. Cf. Marquardt, *l. c.* p. 272, and Tacitus, *ab excess.* I, 39; 57. There was also an altar at Narbo, but we cannot be entirely sure that it was provincial. Cf. *CIL.* XII, 4333. Another altar was that erected to Augustus after 31 A.D. by the *civitates Liburniae*. Cf. *CIL.* III, 2810, and Marquardt, *l. c.* p. 300, note 5.

Annals¹: *Templum ut in colonia Tarraconensi strueretur Augusto petentibus Hispanis permissum datumque in omnes provincias exemplum*. This temple, which may be seen on coins, was apparently inscribed *Deo Augusto*². The words of Tacitus, "*datumque in omnes provincias exemplum*", suggest a number of interesting questions, for we know that Augustus had already allowed temples to himself and Roma at Pergamum in Asia, at Nicomedia in Bithynia, and Ancyra in Galatia³. If this was the case, it may well be asked how Tarraconensis could be said to set the example to other provinces. There are various explanations offered for this difficulty. Beurlier⁴ supposes that *omnes provincias* refers only to the other provinces of Spain. Mispoulet⁵ refers this solely to the western provinces. Both of these distinctions are entirely arbitrary. Nipperday is much more reasonable in explaining this as the first national temple to *divus Augustus* alone, and says the example lay in the necessity imposed on other provinces to act likewise. The principal objection to this interpretation is that the provincial cult of the *divi* was an exceptional one and, therefore, cannot in any sense be said to have given an example to other provinces, where almost without exception the temples were not to *divus Augustus*, but to Rome and Augustus.

It has occurred to me that it would be a much simpler explanation of this passage to say that the example was set to the other provinces by the inhabitants of Tarraco in that they themselves requested the Roman government to be allowed to set up the temple to Rome and Augustus, whereas the temples elsewhere, except in Asia Minor, were set up by the direct act of the central government. This view is confirmed by what we know of some of the earlier cases. Thus the *ara Vbiorum* was clearly introduced by the central government, and was even regarded by the Germans as a symbol of oppression. Thus Tacitus⁶: *Quippe anno quo Germaniae descivere, sacerdos apud aram Vbiorum creatus ruperat vittas, profugus ad rebelles*. Again in a supposed speech of Arminius⁷: *Coleret Segestis victam ripam redderet filio sacerdotium hominum: Germanos numquam satis excusaturos quod*

¹ I, 78.

² Eckhel, I, 57 and 58.

³ Dio Cassius, 51, 20, 7.

⁴ Cf. p. 22 ff.

⁵ *Bull. Crit.*, 1888, p. 256.

⁶ *Ab excess.* I, 57, 2.

⁷ *Ibid.* I, 59, 6.

inter Albim et Rhenum virgas et secures et togam viderint. Aliis gentibus ignorantia imperii Romani inexperta esse supplicia, nescia tributa: quae quoniam exuerint inritusque discesserit ille inter numina dicatus Augustus, ille delectus Tiberius, ne inperitum adolescentulum, ne seditionum exercitum pavescerent. A similar altar was erected beyond the Elbe by Domitius, as we learn from Dio Cassius¹: καὶ τὸν Ἀλβίαν, μηδενός οἱ ἐναντιουμένου, διαβάς, φιλίαν τε τοῖς ἐκείνῃ βαρβάροις συνέθετο καὶ βωμὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τῷ Αὐγούστῳ ἰδρύσατο. At Lyons also the introduction of the provincial cult came under the administration of Drusus². Still later under the reign of Claudius a temple was built at Camulodunum in Great Britain in honor of that emperor, which Tacitus considers as a symbol of the eternal domination of Rome³. There, therefore, seems every reason for believing that the province of Tarraconensis was the first in the Occident in which the inhabitants themselves took the initiative in establishing the cult of Augustus. If we remember the condition of the Roman state when Augustus came into power, we shall see that these energetic efforts of various members of the imperial family to establish an imperial cult in the provinces are exactly what we should expect. The feeling of Italy towards the new government was long uncertain. It was, therefore, absolutely essential that the provinces should be firmly united in support of the new government. To attain this end, what could be more natural than that the imperial government should actively interest itself in the propagation of a worship which was addressed to the conception of Roman civilization as embodied in the reigning emperor?

At this point it may not be out of place to say a few words upon the often discussed and rather profitless question of whether the provincial or the municipal cult was the earlier. It seems to me that we cannot give any direct answer to this question. In the Occident it was apparently the custom of the emperor or his representative to establish first in some great provincial centre an altar or temple for the imperial worship, which should serve as an example to all the other municipalities of the province. As municipality after municipality followed the

¹ Dio Cassius, 55, X (édition Gros, VII, p. 600).

² Hirschfeld, *l. c.* p. 839.

³ Tacitus, *ab excess.* 14, 31; Seneca, *Apocol.* 8.

example thus set, the original seat of the worship came to be held in higher and higher reverence. By this reaction of the cults of the various municipalities upon the original seat of the cult, a provincial organization was evolved in which all of these municipalities took part. Let us take a concrete instance. We have first the altar and later the temple established at Tarraco. Then the worship spreads by imitation of these models among all the towns of Tarraconensis until in course of time 36 different cities come to be associated in the great provincial cult which gradually grew up around the original altar and temple¹. The provincial flamine thus became the most honorable office within the reach of the provincials.

The imperial cult was introduced into Baetica at a much later date and never attained such a high development as it did in Tarraconensis. Apparently the time of introduction is set for the year 25 A.D. by the following passage from the *Annals* of Tacitus²: *Per idem tempus Hispania Vltior missis ad senatum legatis oravit ut exemplo Asiae delubrum Tiberio matrique eius exstrueret*. Krascheninnikoff³ argues with more ingenuity than probability that the cult was not introduced until a much later period, possibly under Titus. The inscription found at Castulo, 3271, may (or may not) have some bearing on this point:

Fisci curator divi Ti. II in Baetica prae. Galleciae pref. fisci Germaniae Caesarum imp. tribuno leg. VII, flamine Augustali in Baetica primo.

Krascheninnikoff unhesitatingly declares that the emperor here mentioned is Titus, not Tiberius. Certainly Tiberius was never canonized. On the other hand, the usual abbreviation for Tiberius is Ti., for Titus T. If we refer this inscription to the reign of Titus, as we probably must, Krascheninnikoff apparently holds that since *primus* must have a chronological meaning, this inscription shows a late date for the provincial cult in Baetica. It seems to me, however, that it is by no means established that in this inscription the adjective *primus*

¹ This view is confirmed by the fact that these cult centres are not always limited by provincial lines. Some of these centres, in some instances, draw from more than one province, and others from only a portion of a province. Cf. Beurlier, p. 105.

² 4, 37, 1.

³ *Ueber die Einführung des provinziellen Kaisercultus im römischen Westen. Philologus*, LIII, pp. 147-189.

must bear a chronological meaning. On the contrary, I find it much more natural to assign to it a purely honorary significance. We seem to have plenty of analogies for this view. Thus, at Caesarobriga, 895, Domitia Proculina is *flaminica municipii sui prima et perpetua*. At Cartima, 1956, Iunia Rustica is *sacerdos perpetua et prima in municipio Cartimitano*. It is well known that this adjective as applied to the *Augustales* had a purely honorary sense. Thus, at Suel, 1944, we hear of a *sevir Augustales primus et perpetuus*, named L. Iunius Puteolanus, who is called *VIvir Augustalis in municipio Suelitano D. D. primus et perpetuus*. Outside of Spain, especially in the East, this use of *primus*, or its Greek equivalent *πρῶτος*, is common¹. Even if we give to *primus* a chronological meaning, we are not forced to adopt the view of the Russian scholar. On the contrary, we may suppose that the inscription refers to the first man with the title of flamen, whose predecessors had been called pontifices. This seems most reasonable: first, because, as we have seen, there was a time when the line of demarcation between municipal and provincial cults was indistinct and when one reacted upon the other²; second, because we know, in many cases from inscriptions which can be definitely dated, that the priests of the imperial cult in Baetica were at first called pontifices³. Hence, in the present inscription, the fact that in the reign of Titus we have an official described as the 'first flamen' of Baetica does not compel us to postpone the introduction of the imperial cult to this more distant date. On the contrary, it is a much more rational supposition to hold that a cult of somewhat vague outlines, but essentially provincial and conducted by pontifices, was existing before this period, although the high state of evolution, implying a careful demarcation between the provincial and the municipal worship which we find in Tarraconensis, had not yet been attained.

Lastly, on the history of the establishment of the imperial worship in the province of Lusitania we have practically no evidence. Certain

¹ Cf. Guiraud, *l. c.* p. 83. In the present inscription, though by no means essential, it is not difficult to supply *et. perp.* in which case we should have a precise parallel with the inscriptions mentioned above.

² Cf. p. 137.

³ Cf. p. 120 ff.

municipal inscriptions of comparatively early date have been found¹. Two inscriptions, Nos. 35 and 5184, refer to one Bocchus, mentioned in the works of the elder Pliny as a Lusitanian writer². An inscription of a provincial flamen found at Emerita, 473, certainly suggests that the provincial priesthood of Lusitania devoted itself exclusively to the worship of the *divi*:

Divo Augusto, Albinus Albini f(ilius), flamen divi Aug(usti) Prov(in-
ciae) Lusitaniae.

ADDENDUM

On page 118, line 20, insert: In the following he holds aedileship and duumvirate: 2126, 2129, 3662, 3696, 3697, 3709, 3710, 3860, 4521, 4525, 4610, 4622, 6151.

¹ Cf. *CIL.* II, 5182, 49, 172, 183, 194.

² Cf. note in *CIL.* II, 35, and II, 5184. For another inscription referring to this same man cf. *Eph. Epig.* VIII, p. 356, No. 4.